

REMARKS

With this Response, claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 are amended. Claims 27-37 are added. No claims are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-7 and 27-37 are pending.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Initially, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indications that claims 4 and 5, recite patentable subject matter and that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of their respective base claims and all intervening claims.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Applicant requests entry of the amendments clarifying the specification to be consistent with the formal drawings. Applicant submits no new matter has been introduced.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,939,120 to Harper (hereinafter “Harper”) in view of US Patent No. 3,946,634 to Allen et al. (hereinafter “Allen”).

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended to include the outer sleeve based on original claim 3, “wherein the outer sleeve has a different coefficient of thermal expansion than that of the ball bushing.” The amended claim language is unambiguously supported by paragraph [0051] of the original specification.

The Office Action relies on Allen for disclosure of a ball bushing. However, Applicant notes Allen merely mentions ball bushings may provide transverse support to a piston rod to reduce binding in a cylinder (col. 7, lines 37-42) and does not disclose any difference in coefficient of thermal expansion of the ball bushing or cylinder.

Thus, Applicant submits that the sleeve in the claimed configuration and with the claimed relationship of coefficient of thermal expansion is non-obvious over Harper in view of Allen. On this basis, Applicant requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) rejection of claim 1.

Claims, 2, 4-7

Applicant submits claims 2 and 4-7, as dependents of claim 1, are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons provide for claim 1. On this basis, Applicant requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 4-7.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is amended to specify an embodiment where the outer sleeve, has a lower coefficient of thermal expansion than that of the ball bushing.” The amended claim language finds unambiguous support in paragraph [0051] of the original specification. Because Allen does not disclose any difference in coefficient of thermal expansion of the ball bushing or cylinder, Applicant submits that the sleeve in the claimed configuration and with the claimed relationship of coefficient of thermal expansion is nonobvious over Harper in view of Allen. Thus, on this additional basis (beyond that provided for claim 1), Applicant requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 3.

New Claims

Claims 27-32

New independent claim 27 is added based on original claim 1 with the additional feature that the “thermal expansion of the ball bushing secures the ring portion to an inner dimension of the embossing foil.” Thus, the limitations of claim 27 are similar to those recited in original claim 4 without the limitations of the intervening dependent claims. Applicant submits new claim 27 is allowable in view of the cited references for much the same reasons as original claim 4. New claims 28-32, as dependents of new claim 27 and reciting features similar to claims 2-3 and 5-7, should also be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Claims 33-37

New independent claim 33 is added based on original claim 1 with the additional feature that “the outer sleeve is configured to lift a center portion of the embossing foil to separate the substrate from the embossing foil,” which is a limitation similar to that of original claim 5. Thus, the limitations of claim 33 are similar to those recited in original claim 5 without the limitations of the intervening dependent claims. Applicant submits new claim 33 is allowable in view of the cited references for much the same reasons as original claim 5. New claims 34-37, as dependents of new claim 33 and reciting features similar to claims 2-4 and 6-7, should also be allowable for at least these same reasons as claim 33.

The absence of additional patentability arguments should not be construed as either a disclaimer of such arguments or that such arguments are not believed to be meritorious.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests examination of the above-identified application in view of the response.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections of the claims have been overcome herein, placing all pending claims in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the above-identified application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit any deficiencies or overpayments in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 02-2666, and is requested to notify us of same.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: August 13, 2008

/James M. Howard/
James M. Howard
Reg. No. 56,377

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778